

Attorney Docket No. AUS920030521US1  
Serial No. 10/631,068  
Response to Office Action mailed January 3, 2007

## II. REMARKS

1. Status of the claims. Claims 1, 4-6, 8-15, 17-19, 21-27, 30, 32-34, and 36-41 were pending. This amendment cancels claims 12-13, 25-26, 27, 30, 32-34 and 36-41.
2. Claim rejections 35 USC 112.

The examiner rejected claims 1, 4-6, 8-15, 17-19, 21-27, 30, 32-34, and 36-41 because claims 1, 14, and 27 recite using a conversion table and a dictionary to make a determination whether or not an answer is correct, but the examiner felt that the claims did not explain how this is accomplished. Claims 27, 30, 32-34 and 36-41 have been canceled. Applicant has amended claims 1 and 14 to more particularly point out how the conversion table and the dictionary are used to determine whether an answer is a correct answer. Support for the amendments may be found in the specification from page 12, line 8 to page 13, line 10.

3. Claim rejections 35 USC 103(a).

The examiner rejected claims 1, 4-6, 8-15, 17-19, 21-27, 30, 32-34, and 36-41 as being unpatentable over US 6,077,085 (Parry) in view of US 6,438,515 (Crawford).

Applicant has cancelled claims 12-13 and 25-26, and incorporated the limitations of those claims into claims 1 and 14 respectively. Claims 27, 30, 32-34 and 36-41 are canceled. Applicant has amended the claims to more particularly point out the invention.

In regard to the limitation of displaying a question containing a vocabulary word in the question language, receiving an answer from the user in the answer language, and determining if the answer is correct, the examiner states that Parry discloses "presenting a native language word

Attorney Docket No. AUS920030521US1  
Serial No. 10/631,068  
Response to Office Action mailed January 3, 2007

to the student, and prompting the student to type the target language translation.” (Parry 13:32-34). (The examiner additionally stated that ‘Parry et al. disclose other forms of questioning with regard to vocabulary review (Col. 11:9-Col. 14:6))

But Parry does not disclose giving a user the option to choose a textbook chapter, to choose from four different languages for question language, and to choose from four different languages for an answer language. Moreover, the prior art does not disclose dealing with questions or answers in Simplified Chinese by first converting the Simplified Chinese to Traditional Chinese so that an English/ Traditional Chinese/ Pin Yin dictionary may be used to determine a correct answer.

In regard to the limitation “wherein the determination if the answer is correct is performed using a Simplified Chinese/Traditional Chinese conversion table encoded in Unicode, the examiner states that Parry discloses that “two different languages (such as the native language of a student, and the target foreign language to be learned) may be used, as previously described.” Additionally, Parry discloses “translating (i.e. converting) a phrase into a student’s native language, in order to ask the student a question. (Parry 13:57-62).

But currently amended claims 1 and 14 do not simply translate from one language into another. Rather applicant’s claimed invention uses a conversion table so that Simplified Chinese may be included in the Chinese language systems accommodated by the invention. The prior art does not disclose dealing with questions or answers in Simplified Chinese by first converting the Simplified Chinese to Traditional Chinese so that an English/Traditional Chinese/Pin Yin dictionary may be used to determine a correct answer. In addition, the prior art does not disclose determining if an answer is a correct answer by comparing a vocabulary term and an answer to a dictionary to see if both the vocabulary term and the answer match a dictionary entry.

Attorney Docket No. AUS920030521US1  
Serial No. 10/631,068  
Response to Office Action mailed January 3, 2007

In regard to the limitation of "determining whether an answer is correct using a traditional Chinese/Pin Yin/English dictionary encoded in Unicode, the examiner stated that Parry et al. disclose that "the content to be learned is stored in databases, which include Word tables, Phrase tables, etc. (Parry 6:20-58), and disclose providing a student with a definition of a word, and prompting the student for the word (Parry 3:59-64). The examiner explained that "without using the word dictionary", Parry et al. nevertheless disclose that words, along with their definitions (i.e. dictionary), are used in the invention. The examiner further stated that the invention is "inherently capable of being used to teach Chinese, Pin Yin, English, or any other language as desired by the user."

But applicant submits that the prior art does not disclose the claimed method of determining whether an answer is a correct answer. First the prior art does not disclose using a combined English/Traditional Chinese/Pin Yin dictionary in the manner claimed. Second the prior art does not disclose converting Simplified Chinese into Traditional Chinese in order to be able to use the English/ Traditional Chinese/Pin Yin. Finally, the prior art does not disclose comparing the vocabulary term and the answer to the English/Traditional Chinese/Pin Yin dictionary to determine whether both the vocabulary term and the answer match an entry in the English/Traditional Chinese/Pin Yin dictionary.

In regard to the examiner's rejection of claims 12-13, the examiner stated that "Parry et al. includes the feature wherein a target foreign language may be taught to a plurality of users, each of whom may speak different native languages." (Parry, 2:44-61). Applicant submits that Parry does not teach the combination of language selections by the user and the use of a conversion table and a dictionary to determine whether an answer is a correct answer. In other words, applicant solves the problem of including vocabulary and answers in Simplified Chinese

Attorney Docket No. AUS920030521US1  
Serial No. 10/631,068  
Response to Office Action mailed January 3, 2007

with a system using an English/Traditional Chinese/Pin Yin dictionary to determine whether an answer is a correct answer.

Applicant has amended the claims to more particularly point out the invention. In particular applicant points out that the references cited by the examiner do not teach the combination of the current independent claims, and in particular none of the references cited by the examiner disclose the combination recited in each of the entire independent claims, including determining if an answer is correct by using a Simplified Chinese/Traditional Chinese conversion table encoded in Unicode and a Traditional Chinese/Pin Yin/English dictionary encoded in Unicode in the manner claimed.

Rudolf O. Siegesmund  
Registration No. 37,720  
Gordon & Rees LLP  
Suite 2600  
2100 Ross Avenue  
Dallas, Texas 75201  
214-461-4050  
214-461-4053 (fax)  
[rsiegesmund@gordonrees.com](mailto:rsiegesmund@gordonrees.com)